***THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY***

***W.P.No.21266 of 2005***

***Date:15.11.2005***

G.Beesanna.

----------Petitioner

The A.P State Road Transport Corporation and others

----------Respondents

***ORDER:***

The petitioner was initially appointed as a Conductor in A.P.S.R.T.C. He retired as a Deputy Superintendent on 31.07.2002, on attaining the age of superannuation. After his retirement, he was issued a letter by the 3rd respondent, dated 01.07.2005, stating recovery of a sum of Rs.16,400/- from the petitioner, towards the face value of the ticket blocks lost, while in service. The petitioner challenges the same in this Writ Petition.

Sri P.Govinda Rajulu, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the action of the respondents in proposing to recover the amount referred to above cannot be sustained in law. He contends that the said proceedings were initiated after the petitioner retired from service and at any rate, even assuming that the ticket blocks were lost in the hands of the petitioner, the respondents can recover the cost of the paper and the printing charges of the tickets, but not the value thereof. He placed reliance upon a Judgment of this Court in ***Ch.P.Reddy v A.P.S.R.T.C. and another*** and an unreported Judgment of this Court in W.P.No.8577 of 2005 between ***J.Nageswara Rao & The Depot Manager, APSRTC, Udayagiri Depot***, dated 19.04.2005.

Sri P.Vinayaka Swamy, the learned Standing Counsel for the respondents-Corporation, on the other hand, submits that the petitioner did not offer any plausible explanation for the lapse on his part and that no exception can be

taken to the impugned proceedings.

The petitioner does not dispute the fact that the ticket blocks referred to above were lost from his custody. Having regard to the size of the Corporation and the number of services it operates, occurrence of such incidents is not uncommon. After discussion with Unions, it was agreed by the respondents-Corporation itself that in such instances, the printing charges of the tickets and not the value thereof, are liable to be recovered. To this extent, Clauses 40.06 and 40.07 were added in the Operation Manual. In ***Ch.P.Reddy'***s case, this Court held that the Corporation is entitled to recover the printing charges and not the value of the tickets. The same has been followed in certain other cases also.

Hence, the Writ Petition is partly allowed, directing that the respondents-Corporation shall be entitled to recover the printing charges of the ticket blocks lost in the hands of the petitioner, and not the value thereof. It is further directed that the petitioner shall be liable to pay a sum of Rs.500/- towards penalty for his negligence that resulted in the loss of tickets. The respondents-Corporation shall release the balance amount to the petitioner, within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. There shall be no order as to costs.

_____

**15.11.2005**

**Jsu**